

EXHIBIT 1



United States District Court
for the District of Columbia

RE: *Dentsply International, Inc.*

*City Center Building
1401 H Street, NW, Suite 4000
Washington, DC 20530*

September 15, 2005

By facsimile (202-637-2201)
and electronic mail (margaret.zwisler@lw.com)

Margaret M. Zwisler, Esq.
Latham & Watkins LLP
555 Eleventh Street, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20004-1304

Re: *United States v. Dentsply International, Inc.*; C.A. No. 99-005 (D. Del.)(SLR)

Dear Peggy:

During our telephone call on August 16, we discussed Dentsply's concerns with the language of our proposed Final Judgment. We have now considered those issues and modified the language of some of the provisions in response to those concerns. We have not included permissive language relating to possible changes to Dentsply's distribution system. During our August 16 call, you stated that Dentsply had not yet decided what, if any, changes it would adopt. Regardless of what Dentsply has in mind, we believe the language you included in your draft counterproposal is overly broad.

A month has passed since that telephone call, and we are not willing to delay our filing any longer. We will file our motion to enter the judgment in district court tomorrow.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jon B. Jacobs

cc: Eric J. McCarthy, Esq.

EXHIBIT 2



U.S. Department of Justice

Antitrust Division

*City Center Building
1401 H Street, NW, Suite 4000
Washington, DC 20530*

August 5, 2005

By facsimile (202-637-2201)
and electronic mail (margaret.zwisler@lw.com)

Margaret M. Zwisler, Esq.
Latham & Watkins LLP
555 Eleventh Street, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20004-1304

Re: *United States v. Dentsply International, Inc.; C.A. No. 99-005 (D. Del.)(SLR)*

Dear Peggy:

On June 24, six weeks ago today, we sent you our proposed final judgment incorporating the injunctive relief we plan to seek in this case. Since that time, you and I have had a couple of telephone conversations in which you have raised some general issues of concern to Dentsply, but we still have not received any kind of counterproposal from you. Last night, you left me a voice mail stating that your client had just given you additional feedback and that you were working to incorporate those concerns into your draft.

The Antitrust Division has agreed to an extension, until September 14, for Dentsply to file a petition for a writ of certiorari with the Supreme Court. And as I have told you before, we will not affirmatively seek to have the district court enter, or even actively consider, this injunctive relief until after the Supreme Court acts on Dentsply's petition. But given that Dentsply did not seek a stay of the Third Circuit's mandate, we see no reason not to confer and, if necessary, brief the issues concerning relief as soon as possible so that Judge Robinson can turn to this matter at her discretion. We would prefer to know the issues in dispute, so we can perhaps narrow those issues, prior to filing our motion to enter the final judgment. But we also want to keep making progress towards filing that motion, and that does not seem to be occurring. Therefore, if we do not receive a response from you by Friday, August 12, a week from today, we will file our motion on Monday, August 15.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jon B. Jacobs